

# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/654,313	09/03/2003	Robert M. Guidash	86321PCW	4417
Thomas H. Clo	7590 01/09/2008	09/03/2003 Robert M. Guidash 01/09/2008	EXAMINER	
Patent Legal Staff			NGUYEN, LUONG TRUNG	
Eastman Kodak Company 343 State Street			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
Rochester, NY 14650-2201			2622	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			01/09/2008	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

• •\		Application No.	Applicant(s)			
Office Action Summary		10/654,313	GUIDASH, ROBERT M.			
		Examiner	Art Unit			
		LUONG T. NGUYEN	2622			
Period fo	The MAILING DATE of this communication app or Reply	ears on the cover sheet with the	correspondence address			
A SH WHIC - Exte after - If NC - Failu Any	ORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY CHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DAINS of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.15 SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. Operiod for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period were to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing ed patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	ATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION  36(a). In no event, however, may a reply be solution will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the cause the application to become ABANDON	DN. imely filed m the mailing date of this communication. IED (35 U.S.C. § 133).			
Status						
	Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>13 September 2007</u> .					
,—	This action is <b>FINAL</b> . 2b)⊠ This action is non-final.					
3)[_]	Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is					
	closed in accordance with the practice under E	x parte Quayle, 1955 C.D. 11, 4	493 O.G. 213.			
Disposit	ion of Claims					
5)□ 6)⊠ 7)□	Claim(s) 1-6,8-14 and 16-18 is/are pending in (4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdraw Claim(s) is/are allowed.  Claim(s) 1-6,8-14 and 16-18 is/are rejected.  Claim(s) is/are objected to.  Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/o	wn from consideration.	·			
Applicat	ion Papers					
10)	The specification is objected to by the Examine The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) accomplicant may not request that any objection to the Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correct The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examine	epted or b) objected to by the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. S tion is required if the drawing(s) is c	ee 37 CFR 1.85(a). Objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).			
Priority	under 35 U.S.C. § 119					
<ul> <li>12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).</li> <li>a) All b) Some * c) None of:</li> <li>1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.</li> <li>2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No.</li> <li>3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).</li> <li>* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.</li> </ul>						
Attachmei		4) 🗀 Interview Sware	n. /PTO 413)			
2) Noti 3) Info	ce of References Cited (PTO-892) ce of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) rmation Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) er No(s)/Mail Date	4)  Interview Summa Paper No(s)/Mail 5)  Notice of Informa 6)  Other:	Date			

Art Unit: 2622

#### **DETAILED ACTION**

## Response to Arguments

- 1. Applicant's arguments, see Pre-Appeal Brief Request for Review, filed on 9/13/2007, with respect to claims 1-6, 9-14, 16 have been fully considered but they are moot in new ground rejection.
- 2. Applicant's arguments, see Pre-Appeal Brief Request for Review, filed on 9/13/2007, with respect to claims 8, 17-18 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

A non-final Office Action sets forth below.

In re page 3, Applicant argues that nothing found in Morris teaches "a readout mechanism that provides a series of output signal values associated with a row sync signal with a number of data signal values corresponding to a number of pixels in a row or desired portion of a row; wherein the output signal values have signals that are generated from pixels within at least two physically separate rows within the array."

In response, regarding claim 8, the Applicant recited claim 8 with limitation "a readout mechanism that provides a series of output signal values associated with a row sync signal with a number of data signal values corresponding to a number of pixels in a row or desired portion of a row; wherein the output signal values have signals that are generated from pixels within at least two physically separate rows within the array." The Examiner considers that claim 8 as recited

still does not distinguish from Morris et al. Morris et al. discloses row decoder 121 provides output signal (a sync signal) to select rows of pixel sensing unit 118 for reading out signal value, figure 5, column 7, lines 9-31. Morris et al. also discloses the decoder 121 retrieves the stored indications of the intensities from pixel sensing units 118 by selectively selecting rows of the pixel sensing units 118, figure 5, column 7, lines 9 - 31. Noted that the signal values that are generated from the array of pixel sensing units 118 (plurality of groups of 2x2 pixels 113), which corresponds to the output signal values have signals that are generated from pixels within at least two physically separate rows within the array, are transferred to output interface 128, figure 5, column 7, lines 9-31.

### Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

3. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

- (e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.
- 4. Claims 8, 17-18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Morris et al. (US 6,665,010).

Regarding claims 8, 17, Morris et al. discloses a camera (digital camera 12, figure 1, column 1, lines 8-20) comprising:

Art Unit: 2622

an image sensor (digital imager 140, figure 5) comprising:

a plurality of pixels arranged in an array of rows and columns (an array of pixel sensing unit 118, figure 5, column 3, lines 5-30);

a readout mechanism that provides a series of output signal values associated with a row sync signal with a number of data signal values corresponding to a number of pixels in a row or desired portion of a row (row decoder 121 provides output signal to select rows of pixel sensing unit 118 for reading out signal value, figure 5, column 7, lines 9-31);

wherein the output signal values have signals that are generated from pixels within at least two physically separate rows within the array (the signal values that are generated from the array of pixel sensing units 118 are transferred to output interface 128, figure 5, column 7, lines 9-31).

Regarding claim 18, Morris et al. discloses the data values are reconstructed in the camera memory (the signals that are readout from imager 140 are stored in memory 263, figure 12, column 7, lines 37-49).

### Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

- 5. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:
  - (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

6. Claims 1-6, 9-14, 16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Morris et al. (US 6,665,010) in view of Abe (US 6,747,698).

Regarding claims 1, 9, Morris et al. discloses a camera (digital camera 12, figure 1, column 1, lines 8-20) comprising:

an image sensor (digital imager 140, figure 5) comprising:

a plurality of pixels (an array of pixel sensing unit 118, figure 5, column 3, lines 5-30);

a color filter pattern (one group of pixels is associated with red color or green color, figure 5, column 3, lines 30-52) spanning at least a portion of the pixels, wherein the color filter pattern forms a plurality of color filter kernels (group of four pixels 113a, 113b, 113c, 113d, one group has red pixel color, another group has green pixel color, figure 5, column 3, lines 5-40) wherein the kernels are arranged in at least two different uniformly distributed sets (each group of pixels includes 2x2 pixels, figure 5, column 3, lines 5-40); and

(c) a mechanism for controlling integration time of the different sets of kernels according to their spatial location, wherein the integration time is different for each set of the kernels (the integration interval of each group of pixels 113a, 113b, 113c, 113d are different, column 3, lines 5-30).

Morris et al. fails to specifically disclose the plurality of color filter kernels having the same colors in a predetermined arrangement. However, Abe teaches a digital camera 10 in which the color filter 13 is divided into a 2x2 pixel matrix M1, each pixel matrix M1 has the same plurality of colors R, G, B (figure 2, column 3, lines 51-60). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the

Application/Control Number:

10/654,313

Art Unit: 2622

device in Morris et al. by the teaching of Abe in order to reduce the chromatic blur which occurs in a reproduced image because of the interpolating process (column 1, lines 40-43).

Regarding claims 2, 10, Abe discloses wherein the color filter pattern is a Bayer color filter pattern (figure 2, column 1, lines 10-21, column 3, lines 51-60).

Regarding claims 3, 11, Morris et al. discloses wherein the color filter pattern is a 2x2 kernel (group of four pixels, figure 5, column 3, lines 5-30).

Regarding claims 4, 12, Morris et al. discloses wherein the integration time pattern is an alternating pattern of two lines at one integration time and adjacent two lines at a second integration time (the integration interval of each group of pixels 113a, 113b, 113c, 113d are different, column 3, lines 5-30).

Regarding claims 5, 13, Morris et al. discloses wherein the integration time for a first set of 2x2 pixels associated with a first kernel is at a first integration time, and the integration time of adjacent 2x2 kernels in the same set of two lines at a second integration time (the integration interval of each group of pixels 113a, 113b, 113c, 113d are different, column 3, lines 5-30).

Regarding claims 6, 14, Morris et al. discloses wherein the integration time pattern of adjacent two lines groups is offset by two pixels (the integration interval of each group of pixels

10/654,313

Art Unit: 2622

113a, 113b, 113c, 113d are different, and each group is offset by two pixels 118, column 3, lines 5-30).

Regarding claim 16, Morris et al. discloses a mechanism that reads out at least a subset of the plurality of pixels and uses the signal values obtained from the readout to determine the integration times of the plurality of pixels (integration times for different groups of pixels are independently controlled (column 3, lines 5-50).

#### Conclusion

7. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to LUONG T. NGUYEN whose telephone number is (571) 272-7315. The examiner can normally be reached on 7:30AM - 5:00PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, DAVID L. OMETZ can be reached on (571) 272-7593. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Art Unit: 2622

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

LN LN 01/04/08

DAVID OMETZ /
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER